DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 228 558 CG 016 584

AUTHOR Lifton, Peter D.
TITLE Personality Correlates of Moral Reasoning: A Preliminary Report.
PUB DATE Aug 82
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association (90th, Washington, DC, August 23-27, 1982).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Students; *Evaluation Methods; Family Environment; Higher Education; *Moral Values; Personality Development; Personality Theories; *Personality Traits; Psychological Patterns; *Sex Differences; Social Values
IDENTIFIERS *Moral Reasoning

ABSTRACT

Although psychologists often disagree over the definition, underlying process, and methodology associated with the study of moral development, they agree that differences disappear among individuals possessing a similar type of reasoning. To study individual personality differences among people identified as moral by the theories of Kohlberg, Hogan, and Haan, 100 college sophomores evenly divided by sex were assessed by self-report and observer personality measures. For Kohlberg's cognitive-developmental and Haan's interactional systems, moral scores were obtained from interview responses to moral issues concerned with drug use. For Hogan's socioanalytic system, moral scores were obtained from the California Psychological Inventory. Data analyses by moral theory resulted in patterns of personality correlates descriptive of distinctive though not necessarily unique types of moral individuals. Analysis by sex supported Gilligan's (1982) work on women and morality. Women appear more socially-oriented, men more individually-oriented. Women tend to focus on practical, real-world issues, men upon abstract, intellectual issues. More importantly, these differences appear ingrained in their personalities. (Author/JAC)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED228558

# PERSONALITY CORRELATES OF MORAL REASONING: A PRELIMINARY REPORT

Peter D. Lifton

University of California, Berkeley

CG 016584

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Peter D. Lifton

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

## Abstract

This research focuses upon the specific question of individual personality differences among people identified as moral by the theories of Kohlberg (1981), Hogan (1973), and Haan (1978). Although a preliminary report, the study provides support for the position that (1) depending upon the model of moral assessment employed, different types of people appear moral and (2) more importantly, within the same method of assessment, males and females identified as possessing similar types of moral reasoning possess dissimilar types of personality. 100 college sophomores evenly divided by sex were assessed by self-report and observer personality measures. Moral scores were obtained for Kohlberg's cognitive-developmental and Haan's interactional systems from interview responses to moral issues concerned with drug usage, capital punishment, and abortion; for Hogan's socioanalytic system from the socialization and empathy scales of the California Psychological Inventory (Gough, 1957). Data analyses by moral theory resulted in patterns of personality correlates descriptive of distinctive though not necessarily unique types of moral individuals. Additionally, analyses by sex provided support for Gilligan's (1982) work on women and morality. Women appear more socially-oriented, men more individually-oriented; women tend to focus upon practical, real-world issues, men upon abstract, intellectual issues. More importantly, these differences appear ingrained in their personalities.

# PERSONALITY CORRELATES OF MORAL REASONING: A PRELIMINARY REPORT[1]

Peter D. Lifton

University of California, Berkeley

A Southern preacher once stated: "If it's wrong and everybody does it, it's still wrong; if it's right and nobody does it, it's still right" (anonymous source). Though simplistic in logic, the preacher's comment is not without merit. His statement implies that standards of morality (viz, right vs. wrong) exist independent of people's actions. In a general sense, modern psychological approaches to the study of morality -- specifically, Kohlberg's (1981) cognitive-developmental, Hogan's (1978) socioanalytic, and Haan's (1978) interactional models -- attempt to provide credit or discredit to this simple viewpoint.

Although these theorists disagree over the definition, underlying process, and methodological paradigms associated with the study of moral development, they tend to agree with the basic assumption that "a moral person is a moral person is a moral person". That is, while each theorist allows for individual differences in personality with regard to types of moral reasoning, each presumes that such differences disappear among individuals possessing a similar type of reasoning. Such a presumption may be incorrect particularly when one considers sex differences and its relation to personality correlates of moral reasoning.

---

[1]Paper presented at the 90th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association in Washington, D.C., August 24, 1982. The author thanks the following people for their assistance: Harrison G. Gough, Wallace B. Hall, Ellen Finver, David Schindler, Maya Kopell, and Maria Eliopoulos.

Address correspondence to Peter D. Lifton, University of California, Psychology Department, 3210 Tolman Hall, Berkeley, CA 94720.

This research focuses upon the specific question of individual personality differences among people identified as moral by the theories of Kohlberg, Hogan, and Haan. Although a preliminary report, the paper provides support for the position that (1) depending upon the model of moral assessment employed, different types of people appear moral and (2) more importantly, within the same method of assessment, males and females identified as possessing similar types of moral reasoning possess dissimilar types of personality.

Theories of Moral Development

If the theories of Kohlberg, Hogan, and Haan describe different types of moral persons, then one reason for this phenomenon may be the different theoretical assumptions each maintain concerning the nature of morality. A brief description of these assumptions follows:

Cognitive-Developmental (Kohlberg, 1969, 1981): For Kohlberg, morality is based upon the universal principle of "justice". Defined as respect for the rights of other persons, this principle exists independent of individual persons or societies; it forms the foundation of moral codes for all humanity. Kohlberg extends the work of Piaget (1932) by stating that while morality follows a sequence of cognitive development, this development does not end with early adolescence but instead continues into early adulthood. Morality follows a six stage pattern of development, progressing from moral reasoning governed by fear of authority (preconventional), to concern for others and society (conventional), to concern for humanity (postconventional). These stages form an

invariant, universal, and non-regressive sequence of development (cf. Lifton, 1982b).

Interactional (Haan, 1977, 1978): Haan also conceptualizes morality in terms of Piagetian principles; specifically, his notions of accommodation and assimilation. Unlike Piaget and Kohlberg, she views morality as more than simply a cognitive skill; it is instead a social skill. In fact, its purpose is the facilitation of social interactions. For Haan, morality is based upon the universal principle of "equality". When people engage in a social interaction, this principle guides them toward a balanced solution among the competing concerns of all parties. Morality follows a five level pattern of development, progressing from concern for self (Level 1), to concern for others (Level 3), to concern for all parties (Level 5). These levels though theoretically not sequential tend empirically to follow a predictable pattern.

Socioanalysis (Hogan, 1973, 1978): For Hogan, humans are by nature and necessity social animals. In order to survive they band together into groups. In order for these groups to survive a set of codified principles develop; in other words, a moral code. Although this need for morality originates in the evolutionary nature of humans, the development of a moral code is a consequence of three personality characteristics. Socialization (concern for society) develops during childhood, a result of interactions with parents, teachers, and other authority figures. Empathy (concern for others) develops during adolescence, a consequence of learning to interact with one's peer group. Autonomy (concern for self) develops during adulthood, a function of introspection, individuation, and a maturing self-concept.

Given the divergent assumptions of each theory individuals identified as moral by one approach may be quite different from individuals identified as moral by another approach. Such individual differences may also be found within each theoretical approach.

## Method

Subjects. A pool of subjects (n=100) was drawn from the archives of the Institute of Personality Assessment and Research (IPAR) at the University of California. This group consisted of predominantly white, middle to upper-middle class college sophomores who participated in a one day IPAR assessment study[2]. The sample contained an equal number of males (n=50) and females (n=50). All data used were collected between the years 1978 to 1980.

Measures. Two sets of data were collected, one concerned with personality characteristics, the other with moral reasoning. The former was generated at the time of the IPAR assessment, the latter for purposes of this study.

Personality Data: Extensive personality data, both self-report and observer, were collected on each subject. For this research project the relevant personality measures include:

Adjective Check List (ACL) (Gough & Heilbrun, 1980): The ACL contains 300 adjectives descriptive of interpersonal behavior, self-conceptions, and personal values. Each subject completed a self-report ACL. In addition, ten observers (faculty and graduate students in psychology) completed ACLs on each subject with these 10 observations composited by applying a "30% rule". If 30% of the

[2]For an extensive description of IPAR assessment procedures refer Wiggins (1973). p.539-553.

judges endorsed a particular adjective, that adjective was considered descriptive of the subject. By this method the endorsement rate of the judges as measured by the number of adjectives checked (~70-110 adjectives) approximated the average endorsement rate of subjects who respond to the ACL as a self-report inventory (Gough, personal communication, 1981). The average alpha reliability of the judges was .80 with a range from .36 to .94 . Thus two types of ACL data were generated, self-report and observer.

California Q-set (CQ) (Block, 1961): The CQ consists of 100 statements each one descriptive of a particular aspect of an individual's personality or behavior. Statements are grouped into one of nine categories ranging from "1" (most uncharacteristic) to "9" (most characteristic). Each category along this continuum is defined by a fixed number of items thereby ensuring a normal distribution. Five observers using the CQ described each subject. These CQs were composited with the resultant composite re-sorted to retain the original normal distribution. The average alpha reliability of the composite was .76 with a range from .40 to .92 .

Family Environment Q-set (FEQ) (Block, 1971): The FEQ consists of 92 statements each one descriptive of a particular aspect of a person's childhood or family situation. Similar to the CQ, the FEQ statements are grouped into nine fixed categories ranging from most uncharacteristic to most characteristic; unlike the CQ, the FEQ is a self-report measure and completed by the subjects themselves.

Moral Data: For this study moral scores for Kohlberg's cognitive-developmental and Haan's interactional systems were obtained by rating each subject's response to questions concerned with various moral issues. These included questions on marijuana, heroin,

and cocaine usage, capital punishment, abortion, and individual vs. societal rights. Each subject was extensively interviewed on these issues and their responses scored blind by four raters (non-interviewers) trained with the Kohlberg (1978) and Haan (1977) scoring manuals. Thus cognitive-developmental and interactional scores were obtained not from hypothetical moral dilemma stories (e.g., Heinz, Desert Story) but rather from responses to actual, personally relevant moral issues (Lifton, 1982a).

A moral score based upon frequency of stage response was assigned to each subject's interview protocol by each rater. Moral scores were composited across raters by weighting pure stage scores (e.g., Stage 4) two points, transitional scores (e.g., Stage 3/4) one point per stage. If the summed weights of a stage exceeded two times the weights of any other stage then a pure stage score was assigned as the subject's overall level of moral reasoning. Otherwise a transitional stage score was assigned based upon the two highest weighted stages. The average interrater reliability of the judges for Kohlberg's system was .73 with a range from .56 to .81; for Haan's system .76 with a range from .51 to .88 .

The moral score for Hogan's socioanalytic model was obtained objectively from subjects' responses to the California Psychological Inventory (CPI) (Gough, 1957). Scores were obtained for the socialization (So) and empathy (Em) scales with the two scores used to derive a 2x2 typology of individuals high or low on each dimension. The sequence of moral development using mean splits was from low to high: (1) LoSo LoEm, (2) HiSo LoEm, (3) LoSo HiEm, and (4) HiSo, HiEm (cf. Hogan, 1973)[3].

---

[3]The third dimension of autonomy was not assessed because of the apparent poor construct validity of the CPI autonomy scale which

Results and Discussion

A correlation matrix by sex was computed to determine the extent of overlap among the moral systems of Kohlberg, Hogan, and Haan. The correlations ranged from .01 (ns) to .55 ($p < .001$) with most correlations non-significant. Even among the significant correlations the greatest amount of common variance between any two sets of moral scores was 30 percent. Apparently each moral system measures a different type of moral development.

---

Insert Table 1

---

Data was next analyzed to determine if sex differences existed with respect to the frequency of moral scores for each theory. The chi-squares were all non-significant; for Kohlberg, $\chi^2(9)=10.16$; for Hogan, $\chi^2(3)=3.16$; and for Haan, $\chi^2(8)=6.38$. From this analysis males and females appeared to be reasoning at comparable levels of moral development.

The absence of significant chi-squares did not eliminate the possibility of sex differences. Such differences might exist but only be reflective in the personality descriptions of the "moral male" and "moral female" within each theoretical approach. Extensive correlational analyses with the personality and moral data were conducted to determine the accuracy of this hypothesis as well as to determine the nature of the difference between each theoretical approach to moral development. These analyses resulted in patterns of personality correlates (both self-report and observer) de-

---

Hogan employed as his model's measure of autonomy (Lifton, in press).

scriptive of individuals possessing the ability to reason in a morally sophisticated manner[4].

Kohlberg's Cognitive-Developmental Model

Males: Moral men according to the cognitive-developmental approach were viewed by observers as somewhat neurotic (if not potentially psychotic) individuals. They were withdrawn, fearful, introverted, incapable of adequate functioning in social situations, and lacking in affect and self-confidence. They were different from most people, aware of these differences, but unable to rectify or cope with this discrepancy. Instead they retreated into themselves, creating their own world and possibly their own reality. Their home environment during childhood was somewhat constrictive and non-emotional. The family was mother-oriented with both parents uninvolved in their child's life. Interestingly, there was a de-emphasis upon such moral values as fairness, equity, and responsibility to others. These men characterized themselves as inactive, unaffectionate, nonargumentative, artistic, and fanciful.

Females: Moral women according to the cognitive-developmental approach were viewed by observers as psychologically stable and healthy individuals. They were well-defended, insightful, articulate, well-rounded, outgoing people whose opinions and advice were solicited by others. They were seen as honest and moral though unpredictable in their attitudes and behavior. They were comfortable with themselves as well as others. Their home environment during childhood was family-oriented and interactive, with personal freedom emphasized along with social responsibilities. Parents were in-

[4]Given the large number of correlation coefficients computed vis-a-vis the limited sample size, two-tailed tests of significance were used to reduce the likelihood of Type I error.

volved with their children, the father being more a free-spirit, the mother a social climber. These women characterized themselves as liberal, honest, energetic, friendly, hard-working, socially-oriented, and extroverted. They maintained an enthusiastic, joie de vive outlook upon the world.

---

Insert Table 2

---

Hogan's Socioanalytic Model

Males: Moral men according to the socioanalytic approach were viewed by observers as interpersonally adept and socially aware individuals. They were insightful, confident, seemingly intelligent if not inquisitive, accepting of themselves and their capabilities. They were psychologically healthy though more socially mature than personally mature. Their home environment during childhood was father-oriented, with the father emphasizing such values as intelligence, education, rationality, fairness, responsibility, and personal independence. In all likelihood the father by his own behavior and attitudes provided a "moral role model" for his children. The mother was perceived as rejecting; she tolerated the child's presence in the home but probably viewed his presence as disruptive of her own life. These men characterized themselves as aggressive, logical, confident, intelligent, and socially skilled.

Females: Moral women according to the socioanalytic approach were viewed by observers as ambitious, enterprising, optimistic, confident, and capable. They were planful and organized but not to the point of inflexibility. They were fair-minded, more rational than emotional, and tended to view themselves in a positive manner.

Their home environment during childhood was child-oriented though primarily because of the parental restrictions and responsibilities placed upon the children. Their sense of morality or at least social consciousness as an adult may have stemmed from experiences as a child of racial, religious, or social discrimination. These women characterized themselves as confident, socialized, aggressive, idealistic, feminine, mature, well-rounded, dependable, and resourceful. They possessed psychological health as well as personal and social maturity.

---

Insert Table 3

---

Haan's Interactional Model

Males: Moral men according to the interactional approach were unable to be systematically characterized by observers. No item from the California Q-set and only one adjective from the Adjective Check List proved to be significantly correlated with the men's moral scores. With regard to self-report data, the childhood home environment of these men appeared to be a difficult if not dismal one. The family tended to be lower class and the child himself experienced ill health during adolescence. Values such as fairness, equity, responsibility to others, and ethics were de-emphasized by the family. These men characterized themselves as inactive, lacking in emotion, affection, or charm, unsocialized, incapable, nervous, tolerant, artistic, and persistant. Their sense of morality as an adult appeared based on their social experiences as a child rather than a result of philosophical or intellectual rumination.

Females: Moral women according to the interactional approach

were viewed by observers as psychologically unhealthy individuals. They lacked meaning in their life, were vulnerable and fearful. These feelings of inadequacy manifested themselves through boastful, complaining, hostile, opinionated, rude, and self-centered behavior. They were seen as resentful, distrustful, evasive, and fault-finding in their interactions with other people. Overall their personality was characterized only in the most negative of terms. Their home environment during childhood was parent-oriented. The mother was a dominant if not domineering figure, possessing more masculine than feminine qualities. The father was perceived as restrictive and sexually seductive creating a possible child abuse (either physical or sexual) situation. The home lacked a genuinely supportive and enriching environment. These women characterized themselves as unaffectionate, unemotional, humorless, reliable, self-controlled, and dissatisfied with their self-image. Their over-controlled and seemingly noninteractive personality may explain their negative social image as reflected by the derogatory observer descriptions.

---

Insert Table 4

---

Overall then these personality correlates and related interpretations describe six distinctive though not necessarily unique types of moral individuals.

Implications and Conclusions

There are several implications to these findings. First, and perhaps most simply, this study documents an empirical relation between personality and moral reasoning. The sophistication of

individuals' moral reasoning appears to systematically vary as a function of their personality. Future research on moral development should take into consideration personality variables (both self-report and observer) when attempting to explain and predict moral reasoning.

Second, genuine differences, both quantitative and qualitative, appear to exist among the theories of moral assessment currently in vogue in the psychological literature. Aside from differences due to a priori theoretical assumptions and ideological convictions, these theories diverge specifically with regard to the type of individuals identified as "moral beings". For men, these types range from Kohlberg's withdrawn, socially inept "philosopher king" to Hogan's extroverted, socially adept "intellectual prince" to Haan's unrefined, nondescript "common rogue". They are clearly different and reflect different assumptions concerning the nature of morality.

Third and finally, differences also appear within each theory of moral development with regard to sex. Such a finding lends credence and support to Gilligan's (1982) work on women and morality. Women appear more socially-oriented, men more individually-oriented; women tend to focus upon practical, real-world issues, men upon abstract, intellectual issues. More importantly, these differences appear ingrained in their respective personalities, perhaps a function of early familial socialization. But these are differences in character structure, not evidence for as Kohlberg (1981) and Haan (1978) have argued the moral superiority of one sex over the other.

These findings need to be replicated. Presently a second study assessing adult couples nears completion. Hopefully, it will substantiate many of the preliminary findings described in this manu-

script. If it should then serious consideration should be given to the role of personality in the development of moral reasoning, focusing in particular upon sex differences as they relate to moral development.

## References


Block,J. The Q-sort method in personality assessment and psychiatric research. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1978 (1961).

Block,J. Lives through time. Berkeley: Bancroft Books, 1961.

Gilligan,C. In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982.

Gough,H. Manual for the California Psychological Inventory. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1957.

Gough,H. & Heilbrun,A. The revised Adjective Check List manual. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1980.

Haan,N. A manual for interpersonal morality. Berkeley: University of California, 1977.

Haan,N. Two moralities in action contexts. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1978, 36, 286-305.

Hogan,R. Moral conduct and moral character. Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 79, 217-232.

Hogan,R., Johnson,J., & Emler,N. A socioanalytic theory of moral development. In W.Damon (Ed.), New directions for child development (Vol. 2). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978, 1-18.

Kohlberg,L. Stage and sequence: The cognitive-developmental approach to socialization. In D.Goslin (Ed.), Handbook of socialization theory and research. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969, 347-480.

Kohlberg,L. Essays on moral development: The philosophy of moral development. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1981.

Kohlberg,L., Colby,A., Gibbs,J., & Speicher-Dubin,B. Standard form scoring manual. Cambridge: Harvard University, 1978.

Lifton,P. A theoretical framework of moral and immoral development. Resources in Education, July 1982a, ERIC #ED212949.

Lifton,P. Should Heinz read this book? A review of Kohlberg's The philosophy of moral development. Journal of Personality Assessment, 1982b, 46, 323-324.

Lifton,P. Measures of autonomy. Journal of Personality Assessment, in press.

Piaget,J. The moral judgment of the child. NY: The Free Press, 1965 (1932)

Wiggins,J. Personality and prediction: Principles of personality assessment. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1973.

Table 1

Correlation Matrix of Moral Scores[a]

| | Cognitive Developmental | Socioanalytic | Interactional |
|---|---|---|---|
| Cognitive-Developmental (Kohlberg) | --- | .04 | .55*** |
| Socioanalytic (Hogan) | .01 | --- | .01 |
| Interactional (Haan) | .31* | .25 | --- |

[a] Correlations of males ($n$=50) above diagonal; females ($n$=50) below diagonal.

***$p < .001$; *$p < .05$.

Table 2

Personality Correlates
of
Kohlberg's Cognitive-Developmental Approach

Males (n=50) | Females (n=50)

CALIFORNIA Q-SET

| CQ Item Description | r | CQ Item Description | r |
|---|---|---|---|
| Is a talkative individual. | -.36 | Wide range of interests. | .29 |
| Anxiety and tension find outlet in bodily symptoms. | .38 | Is fastidious. | -.29 |
| Is introspective; concerned with self as object. | .29 | Thin-skinned; sensitive to criticism or interpersonal slight. | -.32 |
| Initiates humor. | -.27 | Turned to for advice and reassurance. | .34 |
| Rapid personal tempo; behaves and acts quickly. | -.37 | Over-reactive to minor frustrations; irritable. | -.28 |
| Turned to for advice and reassurance. | -.37 | Guileful, deceitful, manipulative, opportunistic. | -.30 |
| Gives up/withdraws in face of frustration and anxiety. | .35 | Unpredictable and changeable in behavior and attitudes. | .35 |
| Self as physically attractive. | -.30 | Insight into own motives. | .31 |
| Subtly negativistic; tends to undermine, obstruct, sabotage. | .28 | Handles anxiety by refusing to recognize its presence; repressive tendencies. | -.28 |
| Vulnerable to real or fancied threat, generally fearful. | .31 | Is verbally fluent; expresses ideas well. | .34 |
| Engages in personal fantasy, fictional speculations. | .34 | | |
| Behaves in assertive manner. | -.42 | | |
| Is self-defeating. | .28 | | |
| Concerned with own adequacy as a person. | .32 | | |
| Is cheerful. | -.30 | | |
| Compares self to others; alert to real or fancied differences between self & others. | .27 | | |

Table 2
(con't)

| | |
|---|---|
| Social poise and presence; socially at ease. | -.32 |
| Tends to proffer advice. | -.28 |
| Emotionally bland; flattened affect. | .28 |
| Is verbally fluent; expresses ideas well. | -.33 |
| Self-dramatizing; histrionic. | -.30 |

FAMILY ENVIRONMENT Q-SET

| FEQ Item Description | r |
|---|---|
| Mother constructively active outside the home. | .30 |
| Maternal pressure to achieve. | .29 |
| Mother neurotic, brittle, anxiety-laden. | .29 |
| Family emphasized the values of fairness, equity, and responsibility to others. | -.39 |
| Parents encouraged discussion of problems. | -.30 |
| Mother emphasized value of physical activity & nature. | -.33 |
| Father teased, playfully contradictory. | -.34 |
| Mother teased, playfully contradictory. | -.29 |
| Father enjoyed paternal role. | -.30 |
| Father emphasized value of physical activity & nature. | .31 |
| Paternal pressure to achieve. | -.31 |
| Mother emphasized value of status, power, material objects. | .31 |
| Sibling rivalry for parental attention. | .30 |
| Responsibilities and chores as a child and adolescenct. | .29 |
| Mother restrictive about dating. | -.29 |

ADJECTIVE CHECK LIST: OBSERVER

| r≥ ±.43 | r≥ ±.43 |
|---|---|
| quiet | - none - |

Table 2
(con't)

| | |
|---|---|
| $r \geq \pm .36$ | $r \geq \pm .36$ |
| assertive*; awkward; inhibited; lazy; reserved; retiring; robust; shy; slow | - none - |
| $r \geq \pm .28$ | $r \geq \pm .28$ |
| absent-minded; apathetic; boastful*; cautious; confident*; dominant*; dreamy; egotistical*; energetic*; forgetful; immature; indifferent; mild; outgoing*; outspoken*; preoccupied; responsible*; self-confident*; silent; sociable*; spontaneous*; strong*; submissive; talkative*; timid; undependable; unselfish; withdrawn | determined; honest; insightful; interests narrow*; leisurely; masculine; natural; submissive*; thoughtful; timid*; tolerant; understanding |

ADJECTIVE CHECK LIST: SELF-REPORT

| | |
|---|---|
| $r \geq \pm .43$ | $r \geq \pm .43$ |
| - none - | - none - |
| $r \geq \pm .36$ | $r \geq \pm .36$ |
| - none - | conservative*; polished*; prudish*; thoughtful |
| $r \geq \pm .28$ | $r \geq \pm .28$ |
| active*; affectionate*; argumentative*; artistic; dreamy | arrogant*; deceitful*; easy going; energetic; forgiving; friendly; indifferent*; irresponsible*; kind; methodical; outspoken; persistent; quick; retiring*; sexy; shallow*; slipshod*; slow; spineless*; stern*; thankless*; trusting; uninhibited; unkind*; unscrupulous*; vindictive* |

* negative adjective correlate

[a] $r \geq \pm .43$ ($p < .001$); $r \geq \pm .36$ ($p < .01$); $r \geq \pm .28$ ($p < .05$).

Table 3

Personality Correlates
of
Hogan's Socioanalytic Approach[a]

| Males (n=50) | | Females (n=50) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CALIFORNIA Q-SET** | | | |
| **CQ Item Description** | **r** | **CQ Item Description** | **r** |
| High degree of intellectual capacity. | .28 | Is self-defeating. | -.34 |
| Skilled in social techniques of imaginative play. | .28 | Emphasizes communication through action and non-verbal behavior. | -.32 |
| Extrapunitive; transfers and projects blame. | -.29 | | |
| Concerned with own body and adequacy of physiological functioning. | -.29 | | |
| Socially perceptive of wide range of interpersonal cues. | .39 | | |
| Projects own feelings and motivations onto others. | -.34 | | |
| Able to see to heart of important problems. | .32 | | |
| **FAMILY ENVIRONMENT Q-SET** | | | |
| **FEQ Item Description** | **r** | **FEQ Item Description** | **r** |
| Father emphasized value of intellectual orientation, or rationality in decision. | .40 | Father emphasized value of physical activity & nature. | -.29 |
| Family emphasized the values of fairness, equity, and responsibility to others. | .29 | Subjected to discrimination due to race, religion, or social class. | .28 |
| Father discouraged steps toward personal independence. | -.33 | Home situation child-oriented. | .29 |
| Father emphasized value of tenderness, love, and interpersonal communion. | .31 | Responsibilities and chores as child and adolescence. | .29 |
| | | Mother was restrictive about dating. | .45 |

Table 3
(con't)

| | |
|---|---|
| Family beset by tragedies and misfortunes. | -.34 |
| Rejected by mother. | .36 |
| Father was educated man. | .37 |
| Relatives played role in socialization. | -.34 |
| Mother indulgent. | .39 |
| Mother restrictive about dating. | -.29 |

ADJECTIVE CHECK LIST: OBSERVER

| $r \geq \pm .43$ | $r \geq \pm .43$ |
|---|---|
| - none - | unambitious* |
| $r \geq \pm .36$ | $r \geq \pm .36$ |
| greedy*; inventive; tough* | ambitious; capable |
| $r \geq \pm .28$ | $r \geq \pm .28$ |
| bossy*; clever; curious; idealistic; robust*; shallow*; stern*; stingy*; stolid*; undependable*; understanding | appreciative; conscientious; despondent*; efficient; enterprising; fair-minded; foresighted; idealistic; opportunistic; optimistic; organized; persistant; pessimistic*; planful; poised; quitting*; self-confident; stable; unintelligent*; wholesome; worrying* |

ADJECTIVE CHECK LIST: SELF-REPORT

| $r \geq \pm .43$ | $r \geq \pm .43$ |
|---|---|
| confident; original; clever | affectionate; interests narrow*; interests wide; resourceful; steady |

Table 3
(con't)

| $r \geq \pm .36$ | $r \geq \pm .36$ |
|---|---|
| ingenious; interests wide; relaxed; self-confident; self-pitying*; spontaneous; weak* | civilized; confident; dependable; determined; distrustful*; dominant; feminine; immature*; intelligent; mature; painstaking; reliable; stable; sympathetic; thorough; versatile |
| $r \geq \pm .28$ | $r \geq \pm .28$ |
| adaptable; assertive; bossy; clear-thinking; conscientious*; friendly; humorous; interests narrow*; inventive; logical; natural; outgoing; show-off; slow*; stable*; unaffected*; wise; witty; worrying* | calm; confused*; curious; enthusiastic; idealistic; indifferent*; obliging; original; persistent; precise; sarcastic; sensitive; serious; unambitious*; unconventional*; understanding |

* negative adjective correlate

[a] $r \geq \pm .43$ ($p < .001$); $r \geq \pm .36$ ($p < .01$); $r \geq \pm .28$ ($p < .05$).

Table 4

Personality Correlates
of
Haan's Interactional Approach[a]

| Males (n=50) | | Females (n=50) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CALIFORNIA Q-SET** | | | |
| CQ Item Description | r | CQ Item Description | r |
| - none - | | Lack of personal meaning in life. | .29 |
| | | Vulnerable to real or fancied threat, generally fearful. | .31 |
| **FAMILY ENVIRONMENT Q-SET** | | | |
| FEQ Item Description | r | FEQ Item Description | r |
| Physically healthy through adolescence. | -.28 | Mother knowledgeable in feminine activities & skills. | -.28 |
| Family emphasized the values of fairness, equity, and responsibility to others. | -.33 | Opposite-sexed parent seductive with child. | .29 |
| Mother emphasized value of physical activity & nature. | -.40 | Mother introverting and internalizing. | -.31 |
| Financial condition of family was poor. | .35 | Parents restrictive of child's activities. | .34 |
| | | Excessive valuation and favoring by mother. | .40 |
| **ADJECTIVE CHECK LIST: OBSERVER** | | | |
| $r \geq \pm .43$ | | $r \geq \pm .43$ | |
| - none - | | - none - | |
| $r \geq \pm .36$ | | $r \geq \pm .36$ | |
| - none - | | discreet* | |

Table 4
(con't)

| $r \geq \pm .28$ | $r \geq \pm .28$ |
|---|---|
| autocratic | boastful; complaining; distrustful; evasive; fault-finding; hostile; irritable; opinionated; peculiar; resentful; rude; self-centered |

ADJECTIVE CHECK LIST: SELF-REPORT

| $r \geq \pm .43$ | $r \geq \pm .43$ |
|---|---|
| affected* | - none - |
| $r \geq \pm .36$ | $r \geq \pm .36$ |
| active*; affectionate*; capable*; charming*; shallow* | curious*; self-controlled; smug* |
| $r \geq \pm .28$ | $r \geq \pm .28$ |
| artistic; autocratic*; civilized*; effeminate*; intolerant*; nagging*; nervous; perservering; persistant | affectionate*; excitable*; humorous*; preoccupied; reliable; severe*; tactless*; witty* |

---

* negative adjective correlate

[a] $r \geq \pm .43$ ($p < .001$); $r \geq \pm .36$ ($p < .01$); $r \geq \pm .28$ ($p < .05$).